

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/955,169	09/19/2001	Keisuke Yoshikuni	Q66293	9425
75	90 07/20/2004		EXAM	INER
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037-3213			WALLS, DIONNE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2003, 0213		1731	

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			B
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/955,169	YOSHIKUNI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
,	Dionne A. Walls	1731	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet	vith the correspondence address	•
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may epply within the statutory minimum of the dwill apply and will expire SIX (6) Mule, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communicat ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	tion.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01</u>	July 2004.		
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	nis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal ma	atters, prosecution as to the merits	is
closed in accordance with the practice under	r <i>Ex part</i> e Quayle, 1935 C	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-12 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.	•	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a	ccepted or b) $\square$ objected t	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	, ,	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	•	-, ,	` '
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a limit	ents have been received. ents have been received in riority documents have bee eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		/ Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date	
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>		Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/955,169

Art Unit: 1731

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Reopening of Prosecution

Upon further consideration of previously presented claims 10-12, a rejection of these claims has been made over the prior art of record, namely Applicant's Admitted Art in view of JP 8-277132. Therefore, the FINALITY of the rejection of the last Office Action, dated April 1, 2004 has been WITHDRAWN. In view of the foregoing, the Amendment to the claims filed on July 1, 2004 has NOT been entered, and PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED as set forth below.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Art in view of JP 8-277132.

Applicant admits, in the instant specification, that a method of manufacturing a glass gob – which includes a reheating/pressing press-molding method - is known where an amount of a molten glass is poured into molding dies, and then the movable portion of each molding die is moved down at a speed higher than the flowing speed of the molten glass. In this way, each molten glass flow is cut into separated portions, so that an amount of molten glass is left on each molding die, and a gradual cooling may be performed to produce glass gobs having various shapes (see page 2). While

Application/Control Number: 09/955,169

Art Unit: 1731

Applicant may not admit that it is known to then spray the molten glass with a gas in order to form a glass gob under such a condition that the molten glass is floated, JP 8-277132 discloses a glass forming mold process wherein small holes are provided in the glass molding die in order to supply inert gas or air to the glass gob which enables it to be "slightly" floated (see English abstract and mechanical translation). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide for holes to blow inert gas or air through the die molds, in such manner, so as to prevent the surface of the glass gob from contacting the molding die surface in order to avoid cracks, dirt, etc. on the face of the glass gob – as taught in JP 8-277132.

Regarding claim 2, it follows that the spraying step would commence in the claimed amount of time after the glass gob has been received in the molding die in order to ensure defects on the face of the molded glass article.

Regarding claims 4-7, these limitations are not deemed to impart patentable distinction since the parameters of the glass and the steps following the receiving of the glass gob are conventional in the glass molding process.

#### Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments filed on January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- Applicant argues that the JP 8-277132 reference does not disclose the claimed "receiving step" or "remaining step", or the reduction (variation) of the gas flow rate.

  However, the Examiner wishes to point out the she has not presented the JP reference

Application/Control Number: 09/955,169

Art Unit: 1731

to teach the "receiving" or "remaining" steps. These steps, she believes, have already been admitted by Applicant in the instant specification on page 2. The only thing that Applicant did <u>not</u> admit, was the spraying of the deposited molten glass with gas in order to provide said glass in a "floated" position. For this reason, the JP reference was introduced to show that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to spray the molten glass received in the molding die with a stream of gas, so that it "floated" upon being deposited, in order to prevent dirt, cracks, flaws from forming in the cooled glass product. Lastly, Applicant has not recited a requirement, in claims 1-7 and 10-12, that the "flow rate of the gas is reduced in the receiving step", as this step is <u>optional</u>. Therefore, the prior art rejection of claims 1-7 over Applicant's Admitted Art in view of JP 8-277132 is still considered proper, and is maintained.

## Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner believes that the instant specification contains allowable subject matter. Applicant has disclosed that the flow rate of the gas is reduced in the receiving step wherein said receiving step is carried out by spraying the molten glass with gas having a flow rate that is lower than the gas used in the spraying step which is carried out after the molten glass has remained on the molding die. If Applicant amends the independent claims, 1 and 10, to require this limitation (as opposed to making this limitation optional), the claims would be allowable over the prior art of record.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dionne A. Walls whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 1731

1195. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7AM - 4:30PM (Every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on (571) 272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dionne A. Walls Primary Examiner Art Unit 1731

July 18, 2004